

Comment Report

STATEWIDE POLICY – INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECT MANAGEMENT

JANUARY 4, 2011

Scope:

This report contains the comments and responses for the statewide review of the *Statewide Policy: IT Project Management*, which was available for review December 3rd to December 31, 2010.

Executive Summary

The purpose of this document is to:

1. Publish received comments, and
2. respond to each comment with recommendations.

Comment was received from three agencies, over the review period.

The gist of the comments dealt with issues that will be addressed as a result of approving the policy.

The recommendation from the policy proponent to the State of Montana Chief Information Officer is to approve the policy based on the response herein.

Comments/Feedback with Response

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Comment/Suggestion</u> | <u>Response/ Disposition</u> |
|-------------|--|--|
| 1. | COMMENT: <Responding Agency 1> reviewed the draft policy, but could not estimate the direct impact without review of supporting procedures and processes. | RESPONSE: Subordinate procedures are under development. |
| 2. | COMMENT: <Responding Agency 2> Having a bit better idea of what the planning and reporting procedures might be, would be helpful. | RESPONSE: The information requirements for the planning and reporting are based on the PMBOK standard. As long as the agency is implementing PMBOK, the information requirements for the procedures will be met. There may be few additional information requirements to meet the requirements of the State CIO, OBPP, or LFC. It is not expected that the information requirements will be radically different than what they are today. |
| 3. | COMMENT: <Responding Agency 2> Better understanding of agency obligations within these planning/reporting procedures will be important. | RESPONSE: The information requirements for the planning and reporting are based on the PMBOK standard. As long as the agency is implementing PMBOK, the obligations will be met. There may be few additional information requirements to meet the requirements of the State CIO, OBPP, or LFC. |
| 4. | COMMENT: <Responding Agency 2> I have also assumed that agency staff will be involved in the development and acceptance of these procedures ? | RESPONSE: Yes, the Project Management Office Advisory Group (PMOAG) which consists of representatives of various agencies have been and will continue to participate in the development of the procedures. In addition, the PMOAG will provide a recommendation to the CIO as they did for the PM policy to move forward. The CIO, if desired, will determine the additional steps for review/acceptance. |
| 5. | COMMENT: <Responding Agency 2> Are all projects governed, or are there price, complexity, etc baselines ? | RESPONSE: No, not all IT Projects will be governed. The first procedure, Project Baseline Approval Report (Draft) Appendix B lists the oversight criteria. If the project meets any of the criteria, the Project Baseline Approval Report (Draft), Status Reporting (Draft), and Closeout Reporting (Draft) procedures will be applicable. The PMOAG will be assisting in the development of the criteria. The criteria will be approved by the CIO in meeting the legal mandates. |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Comment/Suggestion</u> | <u>Response/ Disposition</u> |
|-------------|---|--|
| 6. | <p>COMMENT:</p> <p><Responding Agency 2> It doesn't speak to "oversight".. Agencies in the past have been concerned with a feeling (right or wrong) that these policies/procedures sometimes dictate "control" by SITSD, which isn't normally received well</p> | <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The intent of this policy and related procedures are to enable the agencies by providing clarity and guidance. The PMBOK is a framework of good practices and process that maximize the possibility of project success. The agency is therefore empowered to utilize the scalable nature of PMBOK to meet their needs for project management while ensuring that the information requirements for the executive stakeholders are met.</p> |
| 7. | <p>COMMENT:</p> <p><Responding Agency 3></p> <p>One suggestion in the Scope section was to add the phrase 'on behalf of the State of Montana' at the end of the sentence.</p> | <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The statement in the review draft has been reviewed and edited by the department's attorney, and the draft prose reflected the attorney's requirements.</p> |